

R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

SPECIFICATION

A list of specifications for the abstract is listed in the Office Action. However, other than a reference to "extensive mechanical and design details" no specific objection is listed. However, the Abstract is fully compliant with the details outlined in the MPEP.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Leslie '422 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gill '622 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Leslie discloses a power on restart circuit (Title). Gill discloses a technique for robust resetting of a spin valve head (Title).

In contrast, the present invention provides a method for circuit recovery from overstress conditions, comprising the steps of (A) detecting an event, (B) storing said event, (C) comparing

the stored event to a plurality of known events stored in a table and (D) resetting a device when the event is a first predetermined type and providing recovery when the event is a second predetermined type. The first and second predetermined types are determined in response to the plurality of event types stored in said table. Claims 11 and 12 provide similar limitations. Gill and/or Leslie do not disclose or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention.

In particular, Gill and Leslie appear, at best, to be concerned with resetting a device in response to a detected event. Gill and Leslie fail to disclose or suggest (i) storing the event, (ii) comparing the stored event to a plurality of event types stored in a table, and (iii) either resetting or providing recovery. The cited passage of Leslie (i.e., Col. 2, line 6 to Col. 3, line 15) appears silent regarding such limitations. Similarly, the cited passage of Gill (i.e., Col. 8, line 7 to Col. 8, line 58) also appears silent regarding such limitations. Therefore, Gill and/or Leslie, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

COMPLETENESS OF THE OFFICE ACTION

Aside from a notice of allowance, Applicant's representative respectfully requests any further action on the merits be presented as a non-final action. 37 CFR §1.104(b) states:

(b) *Completeness of examiner's action.* The examiner's **action will be complete as to all matters**, except that in appropriate circumstances, such as misjoinder of invention, fundamental defects in the application, and the like, the action of the examiner may be limited to such matters of form need not be raised by the examiner until a claim is found allowable. (Emphasis added)

No arguments were presented directed to any of the dependent claims. The amended independent claims contain subject matter from one or more previously pending dependent claims. Since no previous rejection was made to the dependent claims, the Action mailed July 15, 2003 was not complete.

Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office
Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.

Christopher P. Maiorana
Registration No. 42,829
24025 Greater Mack, Suite 200
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080
(586) 498-0670

Dated: October 13, 2003

Docket No.: 0325.00497